

w

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. BOX 1450 Alexandra, Viginia 22313-1450

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/621,281	07/20/2000	Dong-Hoon Lee	3430-0126P	4261	
2292	7590 07/16/2003				
	EWART KOLASCH	EXAMINER			
	PO BOX 747 FALLS CHURCH, VA 22040-0747			NGUYEN, HOAN C	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			2871		
			DATE MAILED: 07/16/2003		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Mc
	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Advisory Action	09/621,281	LEE, DONG-HOON
	Examiner	Art Unit
	HOAN C. NGUYEN	2871
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ears on the cover sheet with the	correspondence address
THE REPLY FILED 08 July 2003 FAILS TO PLACE THIS Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	oid abandonment of this application application (ation. A proper reply to a h places the application in
PERIOD FOR RE	EPLY [check either a) or b)]	
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire I ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of 1 (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Offic timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 C	Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE date on which the petition under 37 CF of extension and the corresponding amount of the shortened statutory period for reply ce later than three months after the main	g date of the final rejection. HE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP R 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension on the fee. The appropriate extension originally set in the final Office action; or
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFF		
2. \square The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be	ecause:	
(a) 🛛 they raise new issues that would require further	er consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note b	elow);	
(c) they are not deemed to place the application in issues for appeal; and/or	n better form for appeal by mate	rially reducing or simplifying the
(d) they present additional claims without canceling	ng a corresponding number of f	nally rejected claims.
NOTE: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> .		
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following reject		
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	be allowable if submitted in a se	eparate, timely filed amendment
5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request for application in condition for allowance because:	reconsideration has been consi	dered but does NOT place the
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered becaraised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	ause it is not directed SOLELY t	o issues which were newly
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendments explanation of how the new or amended claims we		
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:		
Claim(s) allowed:		
Claim(s) objected to:		
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-5,7-13 and 17</u> .		
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: 6 and 14-16	<u>5</u> .	
8. The proposed drawing correction filed on is a	a)∏ approved or b)∏ disapp	roved by the Examiner.
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statemen	nt(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s)	· /
10. Other:		BEST AVAILABLE C
	(Pa	could be used
	Silver.	ONNER 30

Continuation of 2. NOTE:

The independent claims 1 and 10 have been amended and raised the following NEW ISSUES that need further searches for new ground rejection: "a concentration of the reflective material scattering on a surface of the transflective film is adjusted according to a main mode of the transflective liquid crystal display device".

This new issues is different from the limitations in claims 15 and 16 where the transflective liquid crystal display device has a reflective main mode with the concentration of the reflective material is increased and a transmissive main mode with the concentration of the reflective material is decreased. A reflective main mode and a transmissive main mode of the transflective liquid crystal display device are two independent and different transflective liquid crystal display device.

Besides, applicant cancelled claim 14, applicant must also cancel claims 15 and 16 which both depend on the claim 14.

BEST AVAILABLE COPY